



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,493	12/10/2001	Vikram Pillai	SBACK-002XX	4559
207	7590	07/28/2004	EXAMINER	
WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109			MOFIZ, APU M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2175	8	
DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/016,493	PILLAI ET AL.
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Apu M Mofiz	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2001.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 01 February 2002 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 1,2,7,8,9,10,15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by “Dirctories” by (Francis Norton, 02/09/2000 and Francis hereinafter).

As to claim 1,9,15 and 16, Francis teaches a system for providing a name space (i.e. the file indicating the directory/file name, position etc.) (page 5) to a computer program (i.e. any computer program that reads the file), comprising: a document (page 5) stored on a computer system (page 1), said document including a plurality of nodes (i.e. the folder or directory node and the file node) (page 5), each of said nodes (page 5) defined using a definitional markup language (i.e. xml) (page 5), wherein said plurality of nodes includes at least one directory node (page 5) and at least one file node (page 5); and wherein said document (page 5) represents a file system (i.e. DOS, UNIX or NT) (page 1, 4) for at least one service (i.e. the file listing service) (page 5) available on said computer system (page 1).

As to claims 2 and 10, Francis teaches wherein said document further comprises a system area (i.e. c:\\temp) (page 5), said system area (page 5) including at least one type attribute (i.e. dirroot attribute specifies that this node is a directory and name attribute and the node name "file" specifies that it is a file) (page 5) corresponding to each of said at least one file node (page 5) and said at least one directory type node (page 5), wherein said at least one type attribute (page 5) distinguishes between said at least one file type node (page 5) and said at least one directory type node (page 5).

As to claim 7, Francis teaches wherein said at least one directory node (page 5) represents a system directory (i.e. c:\\temp) (page 5).

As to claim 8, Francis teaches wherein said definitional markup language comprises Extensible Markup Language (XML) (page 5).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-6 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Directories" by (Francis Norton, 02/09/2000 and Francis hereinafter) in view of Hayman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,966 and Hayman hereinafter).

As to claims 3 and 11, Francis teaches said system area (i.e. c:\\temp) (page 5) of said document further comprises at least one file type node (i.e. dirroot attribute specifies that this node is a directory and name attribute and the node name "file" specifies that it is a file node within the directory node) (page 5).

Francis does not explicitly teach at least one access control attribute corresponding to each of said at least one file.

Hayman teaches at least one access control attribute (col 5, lines 24-60) corresponding to each of said at least one file (i.e. an object or a data file) (col 1, lines 60-67; col 5, lines 24-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Francis with the teachings of Hayman to include at least one access control attribute corresponding to each of said at least one file with the motivation to impose specific limitations on who has access to exactly what computer functions and data on the computer system (Hayman, col 1, lines 48-52).

As to claims 4 and 12, Francis teaches wherein said system area (i.e. where the data about system specific area is entered e.g. c:\\temp) of said document further comprises at least one physical file attribute (i.e. dirroot attribute indicates the physical location of the temp directory/file) (page 5) corresponding to each of said at least one file type node (i.e. dirroot attribute specifies that this node is a directory and name attribute and the node name "file" specifies that it is a file) (page 5), wherein said

physical file attribute (page 5) defines a location (page 5) of a physical file corresponding to said at least one file type node (page 5).

As to claims 5 and 13, Francis does not explicitly teach wherein said at least one access control attribute specifies actions permitted to be performed by at least one user.

Hayman teaches wherein said at least one access control attribute (col 5, lines 24-60) specifies actions (i.e. read, write etc.) (col 5, lines 24-60) permitted to be performed by at least one user (col 5, lines 24-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Francis with the teachings of Hayman to include wherein said at least one access control attribute specifies actions permitted to be performed by at least one user with the motivation to impose specific limitations on who has access to exactly what computer functions and data on the computer system (Hayman, col 1, lines 48-52).

As to claims 6 and 14, Francis does not explicitly teach wherein said actions comprise read, write, delete and add actions.

Hayman teaches wherein said actions comprise read, write, delete and add actions (col 5, lines 24-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Francis with the teachings of Hayman to include wherein said actions comprise read, write, delete and add actions with the

motivation to impose specific limitations on who has access to exactly what computer functions and data on the computer system (Hayman, col 1, lines 48-52).

***Points of Contact***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Apu M. Mofiz whose telephone number is (703) 605-4240. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached at (703) 305-3830. The fax numbers for the group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



Apu M. Mofiz  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100

July 20,2004